Claims 34-66 are present in this application, of which Claims 34, 46-59, 54-60 and 64-66 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 49, 50, 52-60 and 62-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,215,523 (Anderson et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,441,854 (Fellegara et al.), U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0032677 (Morgenthaler), U.S. Patent 6,680,749 (Anderson et al.) and U.S. Patent 6,549,304 (Dow et al.). Claim 51 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from those documents in view of U.S. Patent 6,657,702 (Chui et al.), Claims 34-40, 44-48 and 61, as being obvious from *Anderson '749* in view of *Dow, Anderson '523, Fellegara* and *Morgenthaler*, Claim 41, as being obvious from those five documents in view of U.S. Patent 5,752,053 (Takakura et al.), and Claims 42 and 43, as being obvious from the same five documents in view of *Chui*.

In the aspects of the present invention set out in the independent claims, an image processing apparatus is arranged to designate an image which is being displayed during a slide show, as an image to be subjected later to a specific process (e.g., printing, transfer or the like) and, after completion of the slide show, to process together the images designated during the slide show. Specifically, as clearly recited in each of the independent claims, an image processing apparatus of the present invention is arranged to include a designating (indicating) unit adapted to designate (indicate) at least one image among images displayed with the size larger during automatic and sequential display thereof, as an image to be subjected later to a specific image process, and a storing unit adapted to continue, at least up to completion of the automatic and sequential display with the larger

size, to store information indicating the image designated (indicated) by the designating (indicating) unit as the image to be subjected later to the specific image process during the automatic and sequential display with the larger size. Because of this feature, a user can judge whether an image is good or not during the slide show on the basis of the image displayed with the larger size during the slide show, and thereby can designate in succession each displayed image that appears to need to be subjected later to the specific process, so that the images designated during the slide show are processed together after the completion of the slide show. This feature is not taught by any one of the cited references, nor as far as Applicant can see is it taught by any combination of them.

Claims 34, 46, 47 and 48

Anderson displays a large thumbnail 854 and application-specific items which are displayed as images with smaller size than the large thumbnail. However, as the Examiner states in the Office Action (page 8, fourth paragraph), this reference fails to teach automatic and sequential display of images with larger size. _Anderson_ therefore does not disclose or suggest the designating unit ("a designating unit adapted to designate at least one image among the images displayed by said second display control unit in the size larger than that of the reduction image, as an image to be subjected later to a specific image process") or the storing unit ("a storing unit adapted to continue, at least up to completion of the automatic and sequential display with the larger size by said second display control unit, to store information indicating the image designated by said designating unit as the image to be subjected later to the specific image process during the automatic and

sequential display with the larger size by said second display control unit") recited in Claim 34.

The last Office Action nonetheless asserts that because Anderson has a unit used for some kind of designation, it has the recited designating unit of Claim 34. This is not believed to be correct, since the designating function in the *Anderson* device does not remotely do what the recited designating unit does. Similarly, the assertion that Anderson does disclose a storage unit, while correct, is not relevant, since Claim 34 does not recite simply a storage unit, but a storage unit that stores specific information. As pointed out above, the storage unit in the *Anderson* device does not do so.

Dow also does not disclose or suggest the designating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 34 (this reference is relied on as the prior art which merely teaches claimed specifying unit).

Anderson II, in Fig. 8, displays an image selected from among small thumbnails 700, as a large thumbnail 704 of larger size than the small thumbnail. In addition, in Fig.10, this system switchably displays one full-sized image by operating left/right buttons 410. However, as the Examiner states in the Office Action, *Anderson II* fails to teach automatically and sequentially displaying images with large size, and therefore this reference does not disclose or suggest the designating unit and the storing unit, recited in independent Claim 34.

Fellegara uses a slide show for automatically and sequentially displaying images. However, this reference fails to teach designating an image displayed during the slide show and thus does not disclose or suggest the designating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 34.

In *Morgenthaler*, once an image displayed in a slide show is clicked, another browser is activated to access a web site or a server, corresponding to the clicked image. However, this reference fails to teach designating a slide-show displayed image as an image to be subjected later to a specific process, such that the designated images are together processed later, that is, together processed after completion of the slide show. *Morgenthaler*, also, therefore does not disclose or suggest the designating unit recited in Claim 34. In addition, since *Morgenthaler* activates the other browser immediately after the displayed image is clicked, this reference fails to teach continuing, up to the completion of the slide show, to store information indicating the image(s) designated during the slide show and thus does not disclose or suggest the storing unit recited in Claim 34. Because the apparatus of Claim 34 includes this storing unit, it is able, after the completion of the slide show, to process *together* the images designated during the slide show, while *Morgenthaler* (and the other references) cannot do so, because they lack the designating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 34.

In view of the foregoing, *Anderson*, *Dow*, *Anderson II*, *Fellegara* and *Morgenthaler* each fail to disclose or suggest the designating unit and the storing unit, and even when each taken alone or in combination, do not together meet the terms of Claim 34.

Independent Claims 46-48 are method, medium and program claims corresponding to apparatus Claim 34, respectively, and are deemed allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Anderson II fails to teach to designate a displayed image during automatic and sequential display of images with large size. That is, this reference does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit ("an indicating unit adapted to indicate at least one image among the images automatically changed and sequentially displayed by said display control unit, as an image to be subjected later to a specific image process") or the storing unit ("a storing unit adapted to continue, at least up to completion of the automatic and sequential display with the larger size by said second display control unit, to store information indicating the image indicated by said indicating unit as the image to be subjected later to the specific image process during the automatic and sequential display with the larger size by said second display control unit"), recited in Claim 49.

Fellegara also fails to teach to designate a displayed image during the slide show and thus does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 49.

Morgenthaler also does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit recited in Claim 49 since this reference fails to teach to designate, during the slide show, an displayed image as an image to be subjected later to a specific process, as described above. In addition, *Morgenthaler* does not disclose or suggest the storing unit, since this reference activates another browser immediately after the displayed image is clicked. *Morgenthaler* therefore fails to teach to *continue*, up to the completion of the slide show, to store information indicating the image indicated during the slide show, as described above. The apparatus of Claim 49 includes this storing unit and therefore can attain, after the completion of the slide show, to process together the images indicated during the slide

show, while *Morgenthaler* cannot do so, because it lacks the indicating unit and the storing unit.

In view of the foregoing, *Anderson II*, *Fellegara* and *Morgenthaler* each fail to disclose or suggest the indicating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 49, and even when taken in combination, they do not in any way suggest an apparatus having those two units, as recited in Claim 49. Moreover, even if *Anderson '523* and *Dow* are assumed for argument's sake to show what they are cited for with regard to these claims, the proposed combination of references would not meet the terms thereof.

Independent Claims 55-57 are method, medium and program claims corresponding to apparatus Claim 49, respectively, and are deemed allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Claims 54, 58, 59 and 60

Anderson II fails to teach to indicate a displayed image during automatic and sequential display of images with large size. This reference therefore does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit ("an indicating unit adapted to indicate at least one image among the images displayed in full-screen as the slideshow by said display control unit, as an image to be subjected later to a specific image process") or the storing unit ("a storing unit adapted to continue, at least up to completion of the automatic and sequential display with the larger size by said display control unit, to store information indicating the image indicated by said indicating unit as the image to be subjected later to the specific image process during the automatic and sequential display with the larger size by said display control unit"), recited in Claim 54.

Fellegara also fails to teach to indicating a displayed image as an image to be subjected later to a specific process, during the slide show and thus does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit and the storing unit of Claim 54, while this reference teaches the slide show.

Morgenthaler also does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit recited in Claim 54 since this reference fails to teach to indicate, during the slide show, a displayed image as an image to be subjected later to a specific process, as described above. In addition, *Morgenthaler* does not disclose or suggest the storing unit recited in Claim 54, since this reference activates the another browser immediately after the displayed image is clicked, and therefore fails to teach to continue, up to the completion of the slide show, to store information indicating the image indicated during the slide show, as described above. Because the apparatus of Claim 54 includes the storing unit it is able, after the completion of the slide show, to process together the images indicated during the slide show, while *Morgenthaler* cannot do so because it does not have the indicating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 49.

Again, *Anderson II*, *Fellegara*, *Morgenthaler*, *Anderson '749* and *Dow* each fail to disclose or suggest the indicating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 54, and even when taken in combination, do not teach the present invention recited in that claim.

Independent Claims 58-60 are method, medium and program claims corresponding to apparatus Claim 54, respectively, and are deemed allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Anderson fails to teach automatic and sequential display of images with larger size. *Anderson* therefore does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit ("an indicating unit adapted to indicate, during the slide show displayed by said second display control unit, the image displayed automatically and sequentially with the larger size, as an image to be subjected later to a specific image process") or the storing unit ("a storing unit adapted to continue, at least up to completion of the slide-show displayed by said second display control unit, to store information indicating the image indicated by said indicating unit as the image to be subjected later to the specific image process during the slide show displayed with the larger size by said second display control unit") recited in Claim 64.

Dow is relied on as prior art merely to show the recited specifying unit, and does not teach the indicating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 64.

As described above, *Anderson II* fails to teach automatically and sequentially display images with large size and therefore does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 64.

Fellegara fails to teach designating a displayed image as an image to be subjected later to a specific process, during the slide show and thus does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 64.

As to *Morgenthaler*, the click of an image displayed in a slide show should be distinguishable from the indicating unit of Claim 64, as described above. *Morgenthaler* therefore does not disclose or suggest the indicating unit recited in Claim 64. In addition, since *Morgenthaler* activates the another browser immediately after the displayed image is clicked, this reference fails to teach continuing, up to the completion of the slide show, to

store information indicating the image indicated during the slide show and therefore does not disclose or suggest the storing unit recited in Claim 64. Because the apparatus of Claim 64 includes this storing unit it is able, after the completion of the slide show, to process together the images indicated during the slide show, while *Morgenthaler* cannot do this, because it lacks the designating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 64.

In view of the foregoing, each of the cited references of *Anderson*, *Dow*, *Anderson II*, *Fellegara* and *Morgenthaler* each fail to disclose or suggest the indicating unit and the storing unit, recited in Claim 64, and even when taken in combination, do not meet the terms of Claim 64.

Independent Claims 65 and 66 are method and medium claims corresponding to apparatus Claim 64, respectively, and are deemed allowable for the foregoing reasons.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Moreover, Applicant's attorneys will shortly contact the Examiner to schedule a telephonic interview to discuss this application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3869710v1